

DOUGLAS H. MEAL (*admitted pro hac vice*)  
dmeal@orrick.com  
MATTHEW D. LABRIE (*admitted pro hac vice*)  
mlabrie@orrick.com  
ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP  
222 Berkeley Street  
Suite 2000  
Boston, MA 02116-3740  
Telephone: +1 617 880 1800  
Facsimile: +1 617 880 1801

REBECCA HARLOW (STATE BAR NO. 281931)  
rharlow@orrick.com  
ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP  
The Orrick Building  
405 Howard Street  
San Francisco, CA 94105-2669  
Telephone: +1 415 773 5700  
Facsimile: +1 415 773 5759

Attorneys for Defendant Zoosk, Inc.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JUAN FLORES-MENDEZ, an individual and  
TRACEY GREENAMYER, an individual, and  
on behalf of classes of similarly situated  
individuals,

Plaintiffs,

v.

ZOOSK, INC., a Delaware corporation,

Defendant.

Case No. 3:20-cv-4929-WHA

**DECLARATION OF REBECCA  
HARLOW IN SUPPORT OF  
ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO  
SEAL PURSUANT TO RULE 79-5(f)**

JUDGE: The Honorable William Alsup

I, Rebecca Harlow, hereby declare as follows:

1. I am an associate at the law firm Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe, LLP, counsel of record for Defendant, Zoosk, Inc. (“Zoosk”) in the above-captioned litigation.

2. I submit this Civil Local Rule 79-5(c)(1) Declaration pursuant to Civil Local Rule 79-5(f)(3), in support of Plaintiffs Juan Flores-Mendez’s and Tracey Greenamyier’s (“Plaintiffs”)

1 incorrectly titled and incorrectly filed “Administrative Motion to Seal Portions of Plaintiff’s Motion  
2 for Class Certification.” I have knowledge of the facts set forth herein, and if called upon as a  
3 witness, I could testify to them competently under oath.

4 \* \* \*

5 3. On May 20, 2022, Plaintiffs filed a document titled “Administrative Motion to Seal  
6 Portions of Plaintiff’s Motion for Class Certification.” ECF 201. According to the title of  
7 Document 201, such motion would be filed pursuant to Civil Local Rule 79-5(c).

8 4. However, in the last sentence of Document 201, Plaintiffs reference Civil Local Rule  
9 79-5(f) and thus appear to intend Document 201 to be a Civil Local Rule 79-5(f) motion, which,  
10 according to Rule 79-5(f), must be titled as an “Administrative Motion to Consider Whether  
11 Another Party’s Material Should Be Sealed.” It thus appears Plaintiffs filed a Rule 79-5(c) motion  
12 but intended the motion to operate as a Rule 79-5(f) motion.

13 5. Because of Plaintiffs’ apparent failure to comply with Rule 79-5(f), attorneys for  
14 Zoosk did not understand Document 201 to purport to be a Rule 79-5(f) motion until May 31, 2022,  
15 admittedly after the seven days allowed by Rule 79-5(f)(3) to file a Rule 79-5(c)(1) declaration in  
16 support of sealing the materials identified in Plaintiffs’ administrative motion.

17 6. Given the confusion that resulted from Plaintiffs’ failure to comply with Rule 79-  
18 5(f), Zoosk respectfully requests this Court allow this Declaration even though it has been filed two  
19 business days after the deadline set forth in the Rule.

20 \* \* \*

21 7. I have reviewed the parties’ Stipulated Protective Order (ECF 69) and the Court’s  
22 Protective Order (ECF 71) which approved of the parties’ Stipulated Protective Order, subject to  
23 various conditions.

24 8. The Stipulated Protective Order reaffirms that the parties must comply with Civil  
25 Local Rule 79-5 “when a party seeks permission from the [C]ourt to file material under seal.” ECF  
26 69 at 1:24–25.

27

28

1           9.       Plaintiffs’ Motion for Class Certification refers to, incorporates, and attaches as  
2 exhibits material designated “Confidential” pursuant to the Protective Order (the “Designated  
3 Material”).

4           10.       The Designated Material sets forth detailed confidential information concerning,  
5 *inter alia*, (i) the structure of Zoosk’s network and the virtual location of its proprietary property  
6 including its source code; (ii) the security posture of Zoosk’s network infrastructure; (iii) Zoosk’s  
7 data security and incident response practices; (iv) methods purportedly used by unauthorized third-  
8 parties to purportedly access Zoosk’s network; (v) actions taken by Zoosk to prevent and protect  
9 against unauthorized intrusion into its network; and (vi) Zoosk’s detailed financial reports. Indeed,  
10 the Designated Material includes complete deposition transcripts of four of Zoosk’s information  
11 security employees, the deposition transcript of Zoosk’s corporate designee (whose notice of  
12 deposition exclusively identified topics related to Zoosk’s data security), and reports of Plaintiffs’  
13 experts who cite extensively to these depositions, as well as Zoosk’s October 8, 2021 Amended  
14 Interrogatory Responses (again, which respond almost exclusively to questions related to Zoosk’s  
15 data security) and exhibits that contain Zoosk’s detailed financial information.

16           11.       California law requires a party seeking to seal records in or attached to a non-  
17 dispositive motion to demonstrate good cause exists to seal such records. “A ‘good cause’ showing  
18 under [Federal Rule of Civil Procedure] 26(c) will suffice to keep sealed records attached to non-  
19 dispositive motions. *Kamakana v. City & Cnty. of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1180 (9th Cir. 2006).  
20 Rule 26(c) states that if “good cause” is shown in discovery, a district court may issue “any order  
21 which justice requires to protect a party or person from annoyance, embarrassment, oppression, or  
22 undue burden or expense.” FED. R. Civ. P. 26(c). “For good cause to exist, the party seeking  
23 protection bears the burden of showing specific prejudice or harm will result if no protective order  
24 is granted.” *Phillips ex rel. Ests. of Byrd v. Gen. Motors Corp.*, 307 F.3d 1206, 1210–11 (9th Cir.  
25 2002). “The law . . . gives district courts broad latitude to grant protective orders to prevent  
26 disclosure of materials for many types of information, including, *but not limited to*, trade secrets or  
27 other confidential research, development, or commercial information.” *Id.* (citing FED. R. CIV. P.  
28 26(c)(7)). “When a court grants a protective order for information produced during discovery, it

1 already has determined that ‘good cause’ exists to protect this information from being disclosed to  
2 the public by balancing the needs for discovery against the need for confidentiality.” *Id.* at 1213.  
3 “Therefore, when a party attaches a sealed discovery document to a nondispositive motion, the  
4 usual presumption of the public’s right of access is rebutted.” *Id.*

5 12. Good cause exists to seal the Designated Material. The Designated Material  
6 constitutes trade secrets and confidential research, development, and commercial information.  
7 Failure to seal and disclosure of the Designated Material will expose Zoosk and the PII of Zoosk’s  
8 users to an exponentially increased risk of unauthorized access and criminal hacking. Failure to  
9 seal and disclosure of the Designated Material will also cause competitive harm to Zoosk.

10 13. Here, no alternative that is less restrictive than sealing the Designated Material is  
11 sufficient. While Zoosk believes it was exceedingly unnecessary for Plaintiffs to file and then seek  
12 to seal complete deposition transcripts as attachments to its non-dispositive motion rather than file  
13 selected relevant excerpts, because Plaintiffs have chosen to file the complete transcripts, good  
14 cause exists to seal the entirety of the Designated Materials.

15 14. For the foregoing reasons and pursuant to Civil Local Rule 79-5(f) and Federal Rule  
16 of Civil Procedure 26, the Designated Material should be filed under seal and Plaintiffs’ Proposed  
17 Order (ECF 201.12) should be granted.

18  
19 Dated: June 1, 2022

**ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP**

20  
21 By: /s/ Rebecca Harlow  
22 REBECCA HARLOW  
23 Attorney for Defendant  
24 Zoosk, Inc.  
25  
26  
27  
28